

States Magistrate Judge to file written objections. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).¹ Over fourteen days have elapsed since Plaintiff was served with the R&R, and no objections have been filed. *See* Certified Mail Receipt, ECF No. 75.

When parties do not file written objections, courts apply a “clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law” standard of review to a report and recommendation. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (“[T]he ‘clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law’ standard of review . . . is appropriate . . . where there has been no objection to the magistrate’s ruling.”); *Rodriguez v. Bowen*, 857 F.2d 275, 276–77 (5th Cir. 1988) (“[A] party is not entitled to de novo review of a magistrate’s finding and recommendations if objections are not raised in writing by the aggrieved party . . . after being served with a copy of the magistrate’s report.”). After reviewing the R&R, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and finds that they are neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. *See Wilson*, 864 F.2d at 1221.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the R&R, ECF No. 72, in its entirety. The Court **ORDERS** that the Roofers’ Motion to Dismiss, ECF No. 62, is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the City’s Motion to Dismiss, ECF No. 64, is **GRANTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all of Plaintiff’s claims against the Roofers and the City, the only remaining Defendants, are **DISMISSED**.

The Clerk shall close the case.

¹ Federal district courts conduct de novo review of those portions of a report and recommendation to which a party has objected. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) (“A judge . . . shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report . . . to which objection is made . . .”).

SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 22nd day of March, 2023.



KATHLEEN CARDONE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE